

PRECISE SUBELLIPTIC ESTIMATES FOR A CLASS OF SPECIAL DOMAINS

TRAN VU KHANH AND GIUSEPPE ZAMPIERI

ABSTRACT. For the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on a regular coordinate domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, we prove ϵ -subelliptic estimates for an index ϵ which is in some cases better than $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2m}$ (m being the *multiplicity*) as it was previously proved by Catlin and Cho in [4]. This also supplies a much simplified proof of the existing literature. Our approach is founded on the method by Catlin in [3] which consists in constructing a family of weights $\{\phi^\delta\}$ whose Levi form is bigger than $\delta^{-2\epsilon}$ on the δ -strip around $\partial\Omega$.

MSC: 32F10, 32F20, 32N15, 32T25

1. INTRODUCTION

Regular coordinate domains have ϵ -subelliptic estimates; we discuss here about the optimal ϵ . These domains are defined by

$$(1.1) \quad 2\operatorname{Re} z_{n+1} + \sum_{j=1}^N |f_j(z)|^2 < 0, \quad \text{for } (z, z_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C},$$

where the f_j 's are holomorphic functions in a neighborhood of 0 which satisfy $f_j = f(z_1, \dots, z_j)$ and $f_j(0, \dots, 0, z_j) \neq 0$. We denote by m_j the smallest index such that $\partial_{z_j}^{m_j} f_j \neq 0$ and define $m := \prod_{j=1, \dots, n} m_j$. The

D'Angelo's type D is the order of contact of $\partial\Omega$ with any complex 1-dimensional complex variety. For these domains it is readily seen that $\sum_j |f_j|^2 \gtrsim |z|^{2m}$ which implies $D \leq 2m$. Moreover, according to Catlin [1], we must have $\epsilon \leq \frac{1}{D}$ and, conversely, it is a conjecture by D'Angelo's [7] that $\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{2m}$. (Indeed, the conjecture is formulated for more general special domains and in this case the integer m is the *multiplicity*.) We present a simplified proof of a recent result by Catlin and Cho [4] which gives positive answer to the conjecture for coordinate domains. More important, we find an intermediate number $\frac{1}{2m} \leq \frac{\gamma}{2} \leq \frac{1}{D}$ obtained by combining vanishing orders of the f_j 's in different directions and prove subelliptic estimates for ϵ coinciding with this new number $\frac{\gamma}{2}$. For instance, consider the domain defined by (1.1) for the choice $f_1 = z_1^{m_1}$

and then

$$(1.2) \quad f_j(z) = z_j^{m_j} + z_{j-1}^{l_j}, \quad l_j \leq m_{j-1}, \quad j = 2, \dots, n.$$

According to Theorem 2.3, we set $\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{m_1}$, define inductively $\gamma_j = \min_{i \leq j-1} \frac{l_i}{m_j} \gamma_i$ and write γ for γ_n . (In particular, when $l_j = m_{j-1}$ and $m_j \geq m_{j-1}$ for any j , then $\gamma_j = \min_{i \leq j} \frac{1}{m_i}$.) Then we have ϵ -subelliptic estimates for $\epsilon = \frac{\gamma}{2}$.

Note that we always have $\frac{\gamma}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2m}$ with equality holding only if $l_j = 1$ for any j . On the other hand we have

$$(1.3) \quad \frac{\gamma}{2} \geq \frac{1}{D},$$

which shows that our index of subellipticity is optimal in this example. To prove (1.3), we have just to notice that the curve

$$\mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n+1}, \quad \tau \mapsto (\tau^{\frac{21}{\gamma}}, \dots, \tau^{\frac{\gamma_{n-1}}{\gamma}}, \tau, 0),$$

has order of contact equal to $\frac{2}{\gamma}$. On the other hand, the presence of ϵ -subelliptic estimates for $\epsilon = \frac{\gamma}{2}$ assured by our theorem, yields equality in (1.3).

2. PRECISE SUBELLIPTICITY INDEX FOR A CLASS OF SPECIAL DOMAINS

Let $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$ be coordinates in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and (z, z_{n+1}) coordinates in $\mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}$. We deal with regular coordinate domains $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, that is, domains defined by (1.1) for f_j holomorphic which satisfy $f_j = f_j(z_1, \dots, z_j)$ and $\partial_{z_j}^{m_j} f_j \neq 0$ for some m_j . For these domains we consider the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem and, in particular, the ϵ -subelliptic estimates. These are of the type

$$(2.1) \quad |||u|||_\epsilon^2 \lesssim ||\bar{\partial}u||_0^2 + ||\bar{\partial}^*u||_0^2 + ||u||_0^2,$$

for any $C_c^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ -form u of degree $k \geq 1$ in the domain $D_{\bar{\partial}^*}$ of $\bar{\partial}^*$. Here $|||\cdot|||_\epsilon$ is the *tangential* Sobolev norm of index ϵ . This is said an estimate with ϵ -fractional gain of derivative. It is classical (see [5]) that it implies the local hypoellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem. The canonical solution u of $\bar{\partial}u = f$, that is, the solution orthogonal to $\ker \bar{\partial}$, is C^∞ up to $\partial\Omega$ precisely at those points of $\partial\Omega$ where f is C^∞ . In particular, the Bergman projection preserves C^∞ smoothness. The following theorem has been recently obtained by [4]; we give here a much simplified proof.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be a regular coordinate domain defined by (1.1) with the f_j 's satisfying $f_j = f_j(z_1, \dots, z_j)$. Write*

$$(2.2) \quad f_j = z_j^{m_j} + O(z_1, \dots, z_{j-1}, z_j^{m_j+1});$$

then ϵ -subelliptic estimates hold for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2m_1 \dots m_n}$.

Proof. According to Catlin [3] it suffices to find a family of bounded weights $\{\varphi^\delta\}$ for $\delta \searrow 0$ whose Levi form satisfies $\sum_{ij} \varphi_{ij}^\delta u_i \bar{u}_j \geq \delta^{-\frac{1}{m_1 \dots m_n}} |u|^2$ over the strip of Ω about the boundary $S_\delta = \{z \in \Omega : -r(z) < \delta\}$. Once the functions φ^δ have been found, we have to deform them to new functions $\tilde{\varphi}^\delta$, bounded and plurisubharmonic not only in S_δ but in the whole Ω , satisfying the same Levi conditions as the φ^δ on S_δ ; for this we refer to Lemma 2.2 after the end of the proof of Theorem 2.1. To define the functions φ^δ , we put $\gamma_0 = 1$, $\gamma_j = \frac{1}{m_1 \dots m_j}$, choose $\alpha \geq 1$ and put $\alpha_j = \alpha m_{j+1} \dots m_n$. Note that $(\alpha_{j-1} - 1) - \alpha_j(m_j - 1) = \alpha_j - 1$. We choose a cut off function χ which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \text{supp } \chi \subset (0, 2), \\ \chi \equiv 1 \text{ on } (0, 1), \end{cases}$$

and also take a small constant c to be specified later. We also rewrite the inequality (1.1) which defines Ω as $r < 0$ and define

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \varphi^\delta = & -\log\left(\frac{-r + \delta}{\delta}\right) + \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{h=1}^{m_j-1} \frac{1}{|\log *|} \log \left(|\partial_{z_j}^h f_j|^2 + \frac{\delta^{(m_j-h)\gamma_j}}{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-h)\alpha_j}} \right) \\ & + c \sum_{j=1}^n \chi\left(\frac{|z_j|^2}{\delta^{\gamma_j}}\right) \log \left(\frac{|z_j|^2 + \delta^{\gamma_j}}{\delta^{\gamma_j}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $* = \frac{\delta^{\gamma_j(m_j-h)}}{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-h)\alpha_j}}$. Notice here that $\log * \simeq \log \delta$. The weights φ^δ that we have defined are bounded in the strip S_δ . We use the notations

$$A_j = \delta^{-1} |\partial f_j \cdot u|^2 \quad B_j^h = \delta^{-(m_j-h)\gamma_j} |\partial \partial_{z_j} f_j \cdot u|^2.$$

We also denote by cC_j the Levi form of the third term of (2.3) applied to u ; note that $C_j \gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2$ for $|z_j| \leq \delta^{\gamma_j}$, but, otherwise, C_j can take negative values; however, $|C_j| \lesssim \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2$. We also set

$$D_j = A_j + \sum_{h \leq k_j} B_j^h + cC_j.$$

We first prove an auxiliary statement: the assumption

$$(2.4) \quad \sum_{i \leq i_o} D_i \geq \delta^{-\gamma_{i_o}} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_{i_o}-1} |u_{i_o}|^2 + \sum_{i \leq i_o-1} \delta^{-\gamma_i} |u_i|^2,$$

implies, for any $j \geq i_o + 1$

$$(2.5) \quad \sum_{i \leq j} D_i \geq \delta^{-\gamma_j} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_j-1} \sum_{i \leq j} |u_i|^2.$$

In fact, by iteration, it suffices to prove the statement for $i_o = j - 1$. For that, we first notice that $\delta^{-\gamma_i} \geq \delta^{-\gamma_{i_o}} |\log \delta|^k$ for any k and for any $i \leq i_o - 1$. It follows

$$(2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} A_j + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i &\gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_{j-1}-1} \left(|\partial_{z_j} f_j|^2 |u_j|^2 - \sum_{i \leq j-1} |u_i|^2 \right) + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i \\ &\gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_{j-1}-1} |\partial_{z_j} f_j|^2 |u_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Assume at this point $|\partial_{z_j} f_j| \geq \frac{\delta^{(m_j-1)\gamma_j}}{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-1)\alpha_j}}$; then (2.6) can be continued by

$$\begin{aligned} &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}+(m_j-1)\gamma_j} |\log \delta|^{(\alpha_{j-1}-1)-(m_j-1)\alpha_j} \\ &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_j} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_j-1} |u_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that this controls cC_j when this gets negative; this happens in all cases which follow; hence we avoid to recall it at each step. If not, we can assume $|\partial_{z_j} f_j| \leq \frac{\delta^{(m_j-1)\gamma_j}}{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-1)\alpha_j}}$ and then use B_j^1 . We have

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} B_j^1 + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i &\gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_j(m_j-1)} \frac{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-1)\alpha_j}}{|\log *|} \left(|\partial_{z_j}^2 f_j|^2 |u_j|^2 - \sum_{i \leq j-1} |u_i|^2 \right) + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i \\ &\gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}+\gamma_j} |\log \delta|^{(m_j-1)\alpha_j-1} |\partial_{z_j}^2 f_j|^2 |u_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

If $|\partial_{z_j}^2 f_j| \geq \frac{\delta^{(m_j-2)\gamma_j}}{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-2)\alpha_j}}$, then (2.7) can be continued by

$$\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}+\gamma_j+\gamma_{j-1}-2\gamma_j} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_j-1} |u_j|^2.$$

If $|\partial_{z_j}^2 f_j| \leq \frac{\delta^{(m_j-2)\gamma_j}}{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-2)\alpha_j}}$, we pass to B_j^2 . In this way we jump from $\partial_{z_j}^{h-1} f_j$ to $\partial_{z_j}^h f_j$ until we reach $B_j^{m_j-1}$. At this stage we have $|\partial_{z_j}^{m_j-1} f_j| \leq \frac{\delta^{\gamma_j}}{|\log \delta|^{\alpha_j-1}}$ which yields readily

$$B_j^{m_j-1} \geq \delta^{-\gamma_j} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_j-1} |u_j|^2.$$

This proves that (2.4) for $i_o = j - 1$ implies (2.5). By iteration the conclusion is true for any $i_o \leq j - 1$. We now prove that, for any value of z_j

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_{i \leq j} D_i \gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2,$$

whereas, when $|z_j| \geq \delta^{\gamma_j}$

$$(2.9) \quad \sum_{i \leq j} D_i \gtrsim \begin{cases} \text{either} & \delta^{-\gamma_j} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_j-1} |u_j|^2 \\ \text{or} & \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} |u_j|^2. \end{cases}$$

We proceed by induction over j . The first step $j = 1$ is easy. In fact $C_1 \gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_1} |u_1|^2$ for $|z_1| \leq \delta^{\gamma_1}$ and

$$A_1 \gtrsim \max(\delta^{-\gamma_1}, \delta^{-1} |z_1|^{2(m_1-1)}) |u_1|^2 \quad \text{for } |z_1| \geq \delta^{\gamma_1}.$$

In particular, when cC_j takes negative values, these are controlled by A_1 for suitably small c . This proves (2.8) and (2.9) for $j = 1$. Suppose that (2.8) and (2.9) are true up to step $j - 1$ and prove them for j . If $|z_j| \leq \delta^{\gamma_j}$, then $C_j \gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2$. Otherwise, assume $|z_j| \geq \delta^{\gamma_j}$. We show now that, under this assumption, we must have (2.4) for some $i_o \leq j - 1$ unless the second alternative in (2.9) holds. In fact, let $|z_{j-1}| \gtrsim |z_j|^{m_j-1}$; then $|z_{j-1}| \gtrsim \delta^{\gamma_j(m_j-1)} \geq \delta^{\gamma_{j-1}-\gamma_j}$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{-\gamma_{j-2}} |z_{j-1}|^{2(m_{j-1}-1)} &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-2}+\gamma_j(m_{j-1}-1)(m_j-1)} \\ &= \delta^{-\gamma_{j-2}+\gamma_{j-2}-\gamma_{j-1}-\gamma_j m_{j-1}+\gamma_j} \\ &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |\log \delta|^k \quad \text{for any choice of } k. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for any choice of $i \leq j - 2$, we have

$$\delta^{-\gamma_i} \geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |\log \delta|^k.$$

This implies (2.4) for $i_o = j - 1$ which implies in turn (2.5). Otherwise, we assume $|z_{j-1}| \lesssim |z_j|^{m_j-1}$. Now, we point our attention to z_{j-2} . If $|z_{j-2}| \gtrsim |z_j|^{m_j-1}$, then $|z_{j-2}| \geq \delta^{\gamma_j(m_j-1)} \geq \delta^{\gamma_{j-1}-\gamma_j}$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{-\gamma_{j-3}} |z_{j-2}|^{2(m_{j-2}-1)} &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-3}+(m_{j-2}-1)(\gamma_{j-1}-\gamma_j)} \\ &= \delta^{-\gamma_{j-3}+m_{j-2}\gamma_{j-1}} \\ &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-2}} |\log \delta|^k. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have for any $i \leq j-3$, $\delta^{-\gamma_i} \geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-2}} |\log \delta|^k$. This implies

$$(2.10) \quad \sum_{i \leq j-2} D_i \geq \delta^{-\gamma_{j-2}} |\log \delta|^{\alpha_{j-2}-1} \sum_{i \leq j-2} |u_i|^2.$$

The same argument which shows that (2.4) implies (2.5) also serves in proving that (2.10) implies (2.4); in turn, (2.4) implies (2.5). We can therefore assume

$$|z_{j-2}| \lesssim |z_j|^{m_j-1}.$$

We repeat the argument that we developed for $i = j-1$ and $i = j-2$ for any other index $i \leq j-1$. This can be explained by the fact that the second of (2.9) implies the first at each step $i \leq j-1$ (with the cases $i = j-1$ and $i = j-2$ having already been proved). In fact, if $|z_i| \geq |z_j|^{m_j-1}$ and hence $|z_i| \geq \delta^{\gamma_{j-1}-\gamma_j}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{-\gamma_{i-1}} |z_i|^{2(m_i-1)} &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{i-1}+(\gamma_{j-1}-\gamma_j)(m_i-1)} \\ &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_{i-1}+m_i\gamma_{j-1}} \\ &\geq \delta^{-\gamma_i} |\log \delta|^k. \end{aligned}$$

This yields (2.4) and thus also (2.5) unless

$$(2.11) \quad |z_i| \leq |z_j|^{m_j-1} \quad \text{for any } i \leq j-1.$$

On the other hand, when (2.11) holds, then

$$|\partial_{z_j} f_j| \gtrsim |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \leq j-1} |z_i|^2 \gtrsim |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)}.$$

It follows

$$\begin{aligned} (2.12) \quad A_j + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i &\geq \delta^{-1} |\partial f_j \cdot u|^2 + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i \\ &\gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} (|z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} |u_j|^2 - \sum_{i \leq j-1} |u_i|^2) + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i \\ &\gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_{j-1}} |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} |u_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this is in any case $\gtrsim \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2$ and also that it controls $c\tilde{C}_j$, for suitable c when $\tilde{C}_j$ gets negative. So, in this case we have the second alternative in (2.9). This concludes the proof of the theorem. $\square$

It remains to prove the technical lemma which shows how to modify the functions φ^δ to $\tilde{\varphi}^\delta$ so that they are plurisubharmonic on the whole of Ω .

Lemma 2.2. *There are $\tilde{\varphi}^\delta$, plurisubharmonic and bounded on Ω and such that*

$$\tilde{\varphi}^\delta = \begin{cases} e^{2\frac{r}{\delta}} + e^{-2}\varphi^\delta & \text{on } S_{\frac{\delta}{2}}, \\ 0 & \text{on } \Omega \setminus S_\delta. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We take $\theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, $t \mapsto \theta(t)$, convex increasing, that is, satisfying $\dot{\theta} \geq 0$, $\ddot{\theta} \geq 0$ and such that

$$\theta = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } t \leq 2e^{-2}, \\ t & \text{for } t \geq e^{-1}, \end{cases}$$

set $\psi^\delta := e^{2\frac{r}{\delta}} + e^{-2}\varphi^\delta$ and define $\tilde{\varphi}^\delta := \theta \circ \psi^\delta$. Remember that φ^δ take values in $[0, 1]$ and notice that $S_{\frac{\delta}{2}} \subset \{z : \psi^\delta \geq e^{-1}\}$ and $\Omega \setminus S_\delta \subset \{z : \psi^\delta \leq 2e^{-2}\}$; thus $\tilde{\varphi}^\delta = \psi^\delta$ on $S_{\frac{\delta}{2}}$ and $\tilde{\varphi}^\delta = 0$ on $\Omega \setminus S_\delta$. $\square$

We now prove subelliptic estimates for a class of domains with a better index $\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{2m_1 \dots m_n}$; in particular, for the domains defined by (1.1), this index coincides with the optimal value $\epsilon = \frac{1}{D}$. To achieve our goal, we have to specify the vanishing order of f_j in different directions z_i for $i \leq j$.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be a regular coordinate domain defined by (1.1) with $f_j = f_j(z_1, \dots, z_j)$ and $\partial_{z_j}^{m_j} f_j \neq 0$. We denote by l_j^i , $i < j$, the vanishing order of f_j in z_i , that is, we write*

$$(2.13) \quad f_j = z_j^{m_j} + O_j(z_1^{l_j^1}, \dots, z_{j-1}^{l_j^{j-1}}, z_j^{m_j}) \quad \text{for } l_j^i \leq m_i.$$

Assume that each O_j contains no power of z_j of degree $\leq m_j - 1$ and define $\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{m_1}$ and, inductively,

$$\gamma_j = \min_{i \leq j-1} \frac{l_j^i}{m_j} \gamma_i$$

and also write γ for γ_n . Then we have ϵ -subelliptic estimates for any $\epsilon = \frac{\gamma}{2}$.

Proof. Let k_j be the highest power $\leq m_j - 1$ of z_j in O_j and let $r < 0$ be the inequality which defines Ω . We define

$$(2.14) \quad \varphi^\delta = -\log\left(\frac{-r + \delta}{\delta}\right) + c \sum_{j=1}^n \chi\left(\frac{|z_j|^2}{\delta^{\gamma_j}}\right) \log\left(\frac{|z_j|^2}{\delta^{\gamma_j}} + 1\right)$$

and prove that for any $u \in C^n$, φ^δ satisfy $\sum_{ij} \varphi_{ij}^\delta u_i \bar{u}_j \geq \delta^{-\gamma} |u|^2$ over the strip S_δ . We denote by $c \sum_{j=1}^n \varphi_j$ the second term in the right hand

side of (2.14) and define

$$A_j = \delta^{-1} |\partial f_j \cdot u|^2, \quad C_j = \partial \bar{\partial} \varphi_j(u, \bar{u}), \quad D_j = A_j + cC_j.$$

We wish to prove that

$$(2.15) \quad \sum_{i \leq j} D_i \gtrsim \sum_{i \leq j} \delta^{-s_i \gamma_i} |z_i|^{2(s_i-1)} |u_i|^2 \text{ for any } s_i \leq m_i.$$

It is easy to prove the first step, that is,

$$D_1 \gtrsim \delta^{-s \gamma_1} |z_1|^{2(s-1)} |u_1|^2 \text{ for any } s \leq m_1.$$

Suppose we have already proved (2.15) for any $i \leq j-1$. We have to prove that

$$(2.16) \quad \sum_{i \leq j} D_i \geq \delta^{-s \gamma_j} |z_j|^{2(s-1)} |u_j|^2 \text{ for any } s \leq m_j.$$

We recall here that $l_j^i \leq m_i$ and notice that $\gamma_i \leq \frac{1}{m_i}$; in particular, $l_j^i \gamma_i \leq 1$. We have

$$A_j + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i \gtrsim \delta^{-1} |\partial f_j \cdot u|^2 + \sum_{i \leq j-1} \delta^{-s_i \gamma_i} |z_i|^{2(s_i-1)} |u_i|^2.$$

We fix our choice of the s_i 's as $s_i = l_j^i$ which are smaller than m_i ; thus $l_j^i \gamma_i \leq 1$. It follows

$$A_j + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i \geq \sum_{i \leq j-1} \delta^{-l_j^i \gamma_i} \left[|\partial f_j \cdot u|^2 + |z_i|^{2(l_j^i-1)} |u_i|^2 \right].$$

On the other hand

$$|\partial f_j \cdot u|^2 \gtrsim |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} |u_j|^2 - \sum_{i \leq j-1} |z_i|^{2(l_j^i-1)} |u_i|^2,$$

and therefore, since $l_j^i \gamma_i \geq m_j \gamma_j$ for any $i \leq j-1$, we conclude

$$(2.17) \quad A_j + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i \gtrsim \delta^{-m_j \gamma_j} |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} |u_j|^2.$$

This proves (2.15) for the choice $s = m_j$. We prove now (2.15) for $s = 1$; for this we have to call into play C_j . We have

$$(2.18) \quad \frac{1}{2} C_j + \delta^{-m_j \gamma_j} |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} \gtrsim (\delta^{-\gamma_j} + \delta^{-m_j \gamma_j} |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)}) |u_j|^2.$$

In fact, if $|z_j|^2 \leq \delta^{\gamma_j}$, then $C_j \geq \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2$. If, instead, $|z_j| \geq \delta^{\gamma_j}$, and thus C_j gets negative, we have on our side the fact that $\delta^{-m_j \gamma_j} |z_j|^{2(m_j-1)} |u_j|^2 \geq \delta^{-\gamma_j} |u_j|^2$ and therefore it controls cC_j for suitably small c . From (2.17) we conclude that $A_j + cC_j + \sum_{i \leq j-1} D_i$ is

bigger than the right side of (2.18), which yields (2.15) for $s = 1$ and $s = m_j$. The estimate (2.15) for general s with $1 \leq s \leq m_j$ is just a combination of the two opposite cases $s = 1$ and $s = m_j$. $\square$

Remark 2.4. The theorem applies in particular to the class of examples described by (1.2).

We have a final statement which collects in a unified frame the conclusions of Theorems 2.1 and 2.3.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ be a regular coordinate domain defined by (1.1) for $f_j = f_j(z_1, \dots, z_j)$ which satisfy (2.13). Define $\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{m_1}$ and, inductively*

$$\gamma_j = \begin{cases} \min_{i \leq j-1} \frac{1}{m_j} \gamma_i & \text{if } O_j \text{ contains some power of } z_j \text{ in degree } \leq m_j - 1, \\ \min_{i \leq j-1} \frac{l_j^i}{m_j} \gamma_i & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and also write γ for γ_n . Then we have ϵ -subelliptic estimates for $\epsilon = \frac{\gamma}{2}$.

Proof. We use in this situation the family of weights

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^\delta = -\log\left(\frac{-r + \delta}{\delta}\right) + \sum_{\{j: k_j \neq 0\}} \sum_{h \leq k_j} \frac{1}{|\log *|} \log \left(|\partial_{z_j}^h f_j|^2 + \frac{\delta^{(m_j-h)\gamma_j}}{|\log \delta|^{(m_j-h)\alpha_j}} \right) \\ + c \sum_{j=1}^n \chi \left(\frac{|z_j|^2}{\delta^{\gamma_j}} \right) \log \left(\frac{|z_j|^2}{\delta^{\gamma_j}} + 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the theorem is a combination of those of Theorem 2.1 and 2.3. $\square$

Example 2.6. Let us consider in $\mathbb{C}^4$ the domain defined by

$$2\operatorname{Re} z_4 + |z_1^6|^2 + |z_2^4 - z_1 z_2|^2 + |z_3^4 - z_2^3 + z_1|^2 < 0.$$

Here $\gamma_1 = \frac{1}{6}$, $\gamma_2 = \frac{1}{6.4}$ and $\gamma_3 = \frac{3}{6.4.4}$; we have ϵ -subelliptic estimates for $\epsilon = \frac{\gamma_3}{2}$.

REFERENCES

- [1] **D. Catlin**—Necessary conditions for subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem, *Ann. of Math.* **117** n.2 (1983), 147-171
- [2] **D. Catlin**—Boundary invariants of pseudoconvex domains, *Ann. of Math.* **120** (1984), 529-586
- [3] **D. Catlin**—Subelliptic estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on pseudoconvex domains, *Ann. of Math.* **126** (1987), 131-191

- [4] **D. Catlin and J.S. Cho**—Sharp estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on regular coordinate domains, *arXiv:0811.0830v1*, (2008)
- [5] **G.B. Folland and J.J. Kohn**—The Neumann problem for the Cauchy-Riemann complex, *Ann. Math. Studies, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton N.J.* **75** (1972)
- [6] **J. D'Angelo**—Real hypersurfaces, order of contact, and applications, *Ann. of Math.* **115** (1982), 615–637
- [7] **J. D'Angelo**—Several complex variables and the geometry of real hypersurfaces, *CRC Press* (1992)
- [8] **J.J. Kohn**—Subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on pseudoconvex domains: sufficient conditions, *Acta Math.* **142** (1979), 79–122 **156** (2002), 213–248
- [9] **T.V. Khanh and G. Zampieri**—Subellipticity of the $\bar{\partial}$ -Neumann problem on a weakly q-pseudoconvex/concave domain, *arXiv:0804.3112v* (2008)

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI PADOVA, VIA BELZONI 7,
 35131 PADOVA, ITALY
E-mail address: `khanh@math.unipd.it`, `zampieri@math.unipd.it`